



## AGENDA GEORGIA STATE ELECTION BOARD SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

Wednesday, April 22, 2026

ZOOM at 3:00 P.M.

<https://www.youtube.com/@GAStateElectionBoard/streams>

### I. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

John Fervier, as Chairman, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. A quorum was present for all actions taken by the Board. Board Members present were Chairman, John Fervier, Vice Chairman Dr. Janice Johnston, Member Janelle King, Member Salleigh Grubbs, and Member Sarah Tindall Ghazal.

The invocation was given by Executive Director, James Mills.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Fervier.

**Chairman Fervier** announced that the Board's agenda was expected to be relatively brief but would include sufficient time for discussion. He stated that the Board would consider two Petitions for Rulemaking, followed by an Old Business discussion requested by **Member Grubbs**. He further announced that an item would be added under **New Business** to allow the Executive Director to address a recently arising matter.

**Chairman Fervier** also outlined the procedures for public comment. He advised that public comments could be submitted in writing either through the State Election Board's public comment email address ([publiccomment@seb.ga.gov](mailto:publiccomment@seb.ga.gov)) or through the Zoom chat function during the meeting. He noted that no oral public comment would be accepted, and that all public comments for the meeting would be received in written form only through the designated submission methods.

### II. PETITION FOR RULE MAKING

- A. **Petition is submitted by Coalition for Good Governance, Jeanne Dufort, Aileen Nakamura, and Marilyn Marks: Amendment of Rules 183-1-15-.02, 183-1-12-.01, and 183-1-12-.11 (Definition of Vote; Compliance; Backup Balloting)**

Marilyn Marks, Executive Director of the Coalition for Good Governance, acknowledged concerns previously raised regarding the adequacy of the public meeting notice but stated that the petitioners were prepared to proceed while reserving any rights concerning the sufficiency of notice to the public. Ms. Marks introduced attorney Robert McGuire, who appeared on behalf of the Coalition to present the legal basis of the petition. She advised that, time permitting, Jeanne Dufort and Aileen Nakamura might also provide brief comments.

**Chairman Fervier** directed that all presenters be unmuted and advised that the petitioners would be allotted twenty (20) minutes for their presentation, to be divided among the presenters at their discretion. He explained that Board members would have the opportunity to ask questions following the

presentation and reminded the petitioners that the Board retained the authority to seek additional information from any individual it deemed necessary to assist in its deliberations. Staff was instructed to provide time warnings at the five-minute and two-minute marks.

**Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** inquired whether the petitioners wished to postpone the matter if they believed notice had been inadequate. **Chairman Fervier** stated that he had previously addressed the issue with Ms. Marks and that she had confirmed the petitioners had received adequate notice but wished only to preserve any objection regarding notice to the public. Ms. Marks confirmed that the petitioners were satisfied with their own notice and were prepared to proceed.

Attorney Robert McGuire presented the Coalition's legal argument in support of the petition. He reiterated the petitioners' objections regarding the amount of time allotted for the presentation and the adequacy of public notice but proceeded with the presentation. Mr. McGuire argued that the State Election Board possesses both the statutory authority and duty under Georgia law to adopt rules defining what constitutes a vote and to determine when the statutory backup balloting provisions should be implemented if the use of current voting equipment becomes impossible or impracticable. He cited provisions of the Georgia Election Code, including O.C.G.A. §§ 21-2-31, 21-2-281, 21-2-300, and 21-2-334, as well as provisions of the federal Help America Vote Act (HAVA), recent statutory amendments enacted through Senate Bill 189, and judicial findings issued in the *Curling v. Raffensperger* litigation. Mr. McGuire asserted that existing law requires the human-readable text printed on ballot-marking device ballots to constitute the official vote and argued that the Board has the authority to adopt implementing rules consistent with those statutory requirements. He further maintained that implementation of the requested rules would constitute execution of existing law rather than the creation of new law and concluded by requesting that the Board give full substantive consideration to the petition.

Following Mr. McGuire's presentation, Ms. Marks addressed the substantive portions of the petition. Using presentation slides, she discussed the requirements of Senate Bill 189, the distinction between human-readable ballot text and QR codes generated by ballot-marking devices, and the Coalition's position that current Board rules do not clearly identify which portion of the ballot constitutes the official vote. Ms. Marks asserted that, because current voting systems cannot tabulate the human-readable text as contemplated by recent statutory changes, Georgia law requires implementation of the statutory backup voting method utilizing hand-marked paper ballots. She emphasized the need for sufficient planning time, funding, vendor coordination, and county preparation should such a transition become necessary. Ms. Marks also encouraged the Board to conduct an additional in-person work session involving election directors, cybersecurity experts, vendors, and other stakeholders to further discuss implementation issues before any future rulemaking decisions.

At the conclusion of the presentation, **Chairman Fervier** thanked the petitioners for their presentation and acknowledged that the Board had received and reviewed the original petition, supporting documentation, and the amended materials submitted prior to the hearing for consideration as part of the rulemaking process.

### **Rulemaking Petition Discussion – Board Questions and Responses**

Following the presentation regarding the proposed rulemaking petition concerning ballot-marking devices (BMDs), **Chairman Fervier** opened the floor for questions from Board Members.

#### **Member Grubbs' Questions**

**Member Grubbs** questioned presenter Robert McGuire regarding prior judicial findings in the *Curling* litigation and asked why she believed certain findings had not been acted upon. Mr. McGuire responded that he could not speculate regarding the motives of public officials but stated that election-related policy changes often become highly politicized. He asserted that the petition sought only procedural changes designed to ensure voters are able to verify their ballots before casting them.

**Member Grubbs** further questioned Mr. McGuire regarding Judge Totenberg's interpretation of the Board's authority under Georgia law to determine whether a voting system is impossible or impracticable to use in compliance with law. Mr. McGuire stated that, in his opinion, the Court had recognized that responsibility as belonging to the State Election Board.

Additional discussion addressed whether the Board had an obligation to engage in substantive review of

the petition despite pending litigation and whether the Georgia Supreme Court's decision in *Eternal Vigilance* limited the Board's authority. Mr. McGuire distinguished the proposed petition from rules previously invalidated by the Court, stating that the petition was intended to implement existing statutory requirements using objective standards.

**Member Grubbs** also asked whether potential legislative action postponing implementation of Senate Bill 189 would relieve the Board of its responsibility to address the petition. Mr. McGuire responded that, in his opinion, it would not, stating that the Board's statutory responsibilities exist independently of future legislative action.

The discussion also addressed whether the proposed definition of a "vote" would constitute a change in existing law. Mr. McGuire stated that, in his opinion, the proposal merely identified which portion of the ballot constitutes the official vote for purposes of voter verification.

---

### **Discussion Regarding Hand-Marked Paper Ballots**

**Member Grubbs** asked whether existing Georgia statutes governing paper ballots require ballots to be hand counted.

Marilyn Marks responded that the Board's existing emergency ballot rules already recognize the use of optical scan systems with hand-marked paper ballots when electronic voting systems are determined to be impossible or impracticable to use. She stated that additional discussion of the applicable statutes could occur during future rulemaking proceedings.

Ms. Marks further stated that Georgia's current Dominion software version (5.5a) cannot process full-face ballots, while later software versions are capable of doing so. She discussed estimated implementation costs, software upgrades, cybersecurity considerations, and the potential use of ballot-on-demand printers. Ms. Marks asserted that the petition proposed use of existing technology with limited additional equipment for certain counties.

**Member Grubbs** asked additional questions regarding:

- Ballot-on-demand printers previously purchased by counties;
- Emergency ballot inventory requirements;
- The consistency of the proposed rules with existing Georgia law; and
- Language within the petition recommending that counties making good-faith efforts toward implementation not be subject to immediate enforcement action.

Ms. Marks stated that the petition was intended to remain as consistent as possible with existing Georgia statutes while acknowledging that the Board could modify or remove the proposed enforcement language if desired. She also referenced the Board's previous enforcement action involving Athens-Clarke County as one reason the recommendation had been included.

---

### **Member Ghazal's Questions**

**Member Ghazal** questioned Mr. McGuire regarding the legal status of the federal *Curling v. Raffensperger* litigation and whether Judge Totenberg's opinions imposed any currently binding legal obligations.

Mr. McGuire summarized the procedural history of the litigation, including prior injunctions, subsequent appeals, and the current appeal concerning standing. **Member Ghazal** stated her view that no final binding determination presently exists declaring Georgia's voting system unlawful and emphasized that the litigation remains unresolved.

**Member Ghazal** also questioned whether the proposed rules would become effective prior to July 1 if adopted and whether that would affect upcoming elections. Ms. Marks responded that, in her opinion, existing statutory issues predated Senate Bill 189 and therefore required current action irrespective of that legislation.

Additional discussion addressed:

- Interpretation of Georgia Court of Appeals decisions;
- The Board's authority under existing law;
- Legislative efforts to postpone implementation of Senate Bill 189;
- Whether rulemaking should proceed while legislative action remains possible; and

- The respective roles of the General Assembly, the courts, and the State Election Board.

The participants expressed differing legal interpretations regarding the Board's authority and obligations.

---

#### **Member King's Questions**

**Member King** requested additional information regarding the anticipated costs associated with implementing the proposed rule changes.

Ms. Marks stated that, in her opinion, hand-marked paper ballots would ultimately reduce long-term election costs by decreasing equipment, programming, transportation, testing, and maintenance expenses. She acknowledged that counties could incur certain implementation costs, including training and additional ballot-on-demand printers.

**Member King** also asked about:

- Potential staffing impacts;
- Cybersecurity guidance;
- Ballot inventory controls;
- Daily ballot accounting procedures;
- Coordination with the Secretary of State; and
- Proposed language concerning counties making "good faith" efforts toward compliance.

Ms. Marks stated that many implementation details would benefit from guidance jointly developed by the State Election Board and the Secretary of State following consultation with county election officials. She also indicated that the petitioners would be receptive to modifying the proposed enforcement language if the Board believed additional clarification was appropriate.

---

#### **Discussion Regarding Accessible Voting**

**Member Ghazal** raised concerns regarding accessible voting for individuals with disabilities, specifically whether implementation of the proposed system could make ballots cast using accessible voting devices distinguishable from other ballots.

Ms. Marks acknowledged the concern and stated that deployment of newer software versions and updated equipment could address those issues while also improving ballot privacy. She further asserted that the Board possesses authority to require compliance with applicable ballot secrecy laws.

**Member Ghazal** questioned the statutory authority permitting the Board to direct software changes and asked whether any court had determined that Georgia's current system violates federal law or ballot secrecy requirements. Ms. Marks responded that no such final adjudication currently exists but maintained that, in her opinion, the Board nevertheless has a duty to enforce applicable election laws.

**Chairman Fervier** expressed concern regarding the Board's authority to declare a practice unlawful absent a judicial determination. Mr. McGuire responded that Judge Totenberg's rulings addressed the legality of the challenged practices within the ongoing litigation and stated that those rulings supported the petitioners' legal position.

---

#### **Additional Board Discussion**

**Member Grubbs** stated that she was concerned about the Board selectively enforcing election laws and questioned whether the Board could decline to address one statutory issue while routinely enforcing others through investigations and referrals.

Further discussion addressed Senate Bill 189, legislative proposals to postpone implementation, funding considerations, and whether legislative inaction altered the Board's existing statutory responsibilities. Mr. McGuire stated that, in his opinion, the Board's duties remain unchanged unless the law itself is amended.

**Vice Chair Johnston** then asked about the estimated timeframe necessary to implement voting system changes necessary to comply with Senate Bill 189. Ms. Marks estimated that implementation of a fully compliant replacement voting system could require approximately two to three years, depending upon federal certification, procurement, and deployment.

**BREAK – A motion was passed by the Board to take a break at 5:15 pm**

**Motion:** Chairman Fervier moved that the Board recess for a 5 minute break

**Second:** Vice Chair, Dr. Johnston

**Vote:** Passed unanimously (4-0)

**In Favor:** Vice Chair, Dr. Johnston, Member King, Member Grubbs, and Member Ghazal

**Meeting Reconvened at 5:22 pm**

**Petition for Rulemaking – Continued Discussion and Board Action**

The Board continued its consideration of the petition for rulemaking submitted by Ms. Marilyn Marks.

**Member Grubbs** expressed support for allowing additional time to refine the proposed rule and suggested that Board members work collaboratively with the petitioner to address outstanding questions and recommended revisions before the Board voted on the petition.

**Chairman Fervier** advised that the Board's procedural options were to: (1) initiate rulemaking, (2) decline to initiate rulemaking, or (3) continue consideration of the petition if additional revisions were necessary. Ms. Marks indicated her willingness to work with Board members to revise the proposed language and requested that the petition remain pending rather than being withdrawn.

The Board requested legal guidance from **Assistant Attorney General Beth Young** regarding the applicable deadlines under Georgia law. Ms. Young advised that, pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 50-13-9, the Board is required to act on a petition for rulemaking within thirty (30) days of its filing, provided that the statutory period had not expired. She further explained that the thirty-day notice period associated with Legislative Counsel does not begin until the Board formally proposes a rule for adoption.

Board members discussed whether revisions submitted shortly before the meeting should be considered amendments to the original April 8 petition or constitute a new petition. Ms. Marks requested that the Board continue treating the filing as the original April 8 petition while allowing additional revisions before a final vote.

**Member King** stated that she supported the Board's authority to adopt rules but believed the proposal required substantially more detail before she could support initiation of rulemaking. She expressed concern that the proposed rule lacked sufficient implementation guidance regarding election procedures, internal controls, ballot accounting, and county responsibilities. **Member King** emphasized that any rule adopted should be comprehensive enough to withstand judicial scrutiny while providing clear direction to county election officials.

**Vice Chair Johnston** agreed that additional clarification was necessary. She reiterated concerns regarding the statutory definition of a vote and stated that the Board should avoid adopting rules that could be interpreted as legislating beyond its authority. **Vice Chair Johnston** further stated that she favored consulting with legislators regarding any anticipated legislative action before proceeding with comprehensive rulemaking, while recognizing the need for contingency planning should no legislative solution be enacted.

**Member Grubbs** maintained that the Board had an obligation to adopt rules consistent with existing Georgia law and questioned whether delaying action would leave counties without necessary guidance. She stated that the petition should be refined where appropriate rather than abandoned, noting that the Board regularly exercises its rulemaking authority without engaging in legislation.

**Chairman Fervier** stated that, in his view, the General Assembly should be afforded the opportunity to resolve the underlying statutory issues before the Board adopted comprehensive rules addressing those matters. He emphasized that any Board action should remain consistent with current law while avoiding actions that could be perceived as supplanting legislative authority.

Board members also discussed creating a Board working group to evaluate broader implementation issues relating to election administration and potential rulemaking. Members acknowledged the need to obtain input from legal counsel, county election officials, and other stakeholders before adopting any comprehensive regulatory framework.

During further discussion, Ms. Marks reiterated the urgency of providing counties with guidance before upcoming election deadlines and agreed to prepare additional revisions incorporating Board members' feedback. She also indicated her willingness to consult directly with **Member King** regarding additional implementation language requested by the Board.

**Motion:** Member Grubbs moved that designated Board members work with Ms. Marks to refine the petition and present a revised proposal at a special meeting the following week while maintaining the original April 8 filing date

**Second:** Member Ghazal

**Vote:** Passed 3-2

**In Favor:** Vice Chairman, Dr. Johnston, Member Grubbs and Member Ghazal

**Opposed:** Chairman Fervier and Member King

Before moving to the next agenda item, **Chairman Fervier** noted that the Board had devoted approximately three hours to the petition and stated that he believed the proposal had received thorough consideration. Ms. Marks thanked the Board for its deliberation and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to continue working collaboratively on revisions prior to the next meeting.

**B. Petition is submitted by Vice Chair Dr. Janice Johnston to adopt rule (Numbered list of Voters) pursuant to: Rule 183-1-12-.02. Definitions  
Rule 183-1-12-.11(2)(a). Conducting Elections**

**Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** presented a petition to amend State Election Board Rules **183-1-12-.02 (Definitions)** and **183-1-12-.11(2)(a) (Conducting Elections)** to incorporate a definition of the "Numbered List of Voters" and clarify its use during the election process.

**Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** explained that the proposed rule had been revised following the prior meeting by removing language suggested during Board discussion. She stated that the petition was intended to reinforce compliance with existing Georgia law rather than create a new legal requirement. The proposed definition described the Numbered List of Voters as one or more consecutively numbered sheets used to record voters' names, in ink, in the order they receive their ballots.

**Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** stated that the Numbered List of Voters is referenced multiple times throughout Georgia Election Code and serves as an official paper election record for reconciliation, auditing, and records retention purposes. She further stated that the document provides an auditable paper record consistent with election administration practices and supports verification of the number of voters against the number of ballots cast.

Addressing questions raised during the previous meeting, **Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** stated that maintaining a Numbered List of Voters does not compromise ballot secrecy or voter privacy because no identifying information is linked to an individual ballot once it is deposited into the ballot box. She also explained that the list contains no voter addresses and therefore does not create additional concerns for participants in the VoteSafe program.

**Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** further discussed concerns related to cybersecurity, electronic poll books, ballot images, and electronic voting systems. She stated that the proposed rule does not involve ballot images or voting system technology but instead reinforces the statutory requirement to maintain a contemporaneous paper record of voters. She emphasized that a paper Numbered List of Voters provides an important backup

in the event of electronic poll book failures, synchronization issues, or data loss.

**Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** concluded that maintaining a real-time paper Numbered List of Voters remains necessary for reconciling voter participation with ballots cast and for ensuring compliance with existing Georgia law.

**Member Grubbs** questioned whether the proposed rule was necessary since the requirement already exists within Georgia law. **Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** responded that the petition was intended to reinforce compliance because the statutory requirement has not been consistently followed in practice. She explained that while electronic poll books generate reports, they do not replace the need for a contemporaneous paper record.

**Member Grubbs** noted that Georgia law already requires election officials to preserve the Numbered List of Voters along with other election materials and stated she had no objection to the proposal after receiving clarification that the purpose was enforcement of existing law rather than creation of a new requirement.

**Member Ghazal** confirmed that **Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** had satisfactorily addressed the questions she raised during the previous meeting. She stated that her inquiries were intended as requests for clarification rather than objections and expressed agreement that redundancy and multiple layers of documentation are important safeguards within Georgia's election system.

**Chairman Fervier** thanked **Vice Chair Dr. Johnston** for her presentation and, after confirming there were no further questions from the Board, stated that the Chair would entertain a motion regarding the petition for rulemaking.

**Motion:** Member Grubbs moved to adopt rule (Numbered list of Voters) pursuant to:

Rule 183-1-12-.02. Definitions

Rule 183-1-12-.11(2)(a). Conducting Elections

**Second:** Member King

**Vote:** Passed 3-0

**In Favor:** Member King, Member Grubbs and Member Ghazal

### III. OLD BUSINESS

#### A. Discussion Regarding Election Night Observation at the State Tabulation Center

A discussion was held regarding election night observation at the State's main tabulation center for the upcoming primary election. It was noted that a request had previously been submitted seeking access for observation; however, no response had been received from the Secretary of State's Office. Concern was expressed that the tabulation center should be subject to appropriate observation and oversight, and that authorized observers should be permitted access to promote transparency in the election process.

**Chairman Fervier** confirmed that he had not received a response to the request. **Member King** requested that the Chairman formally contact the Secretary of State's Office and request a written response by a specified deadline so the matter would be addressed prior to the primary election.

**Chairman Fervier** agreed to seek a response from the Secretary of State's Office as soon as possible. Executive Director James Mills requested additional information regarding the operation of the State's tabulation center, including whether county election results are received and processed in that location.

**Chairman Fervier** explained that his prior visit to the facility had been brief and occurred early in his tenure as Chairman. He stated that the visit primarily involved meeting personnel rather than reviewing operational procedures, and therefore he was not familiar with the detailed tabulation process. He did note that the facility contains computer workstations and large display screens but indicated he was unable to provide further operational details.

Executive Director Mills stated that, because statewide election results are processed at the facility, it was important for the State Election Board to understand how the process operates. He further observed that the Secretary of State, who was a candidate in the upcoming primary election, appeared

to control invitations to the facility on election night. Mr. Mills expressed concern that other statewide candidates, as well as representatives of the State Election Board, should have access to observe the process in order to promote transparency and strengthen public confidence in the administration of the election.

**Chairman Fervier** responded that he did not have sufficient information regarding the history, policies, or reasoning behind the current access restrictions and was not prepared to take a position until he obtained additional information. He reiterated that he would request an explanation from the Secretary of State's Office and report back to the Board as quickly as possible.

Executive Director Mills further stated that the Board had already received written communication indicating that State Election Board representatives would not be granted access to the State tabulation center and instead were directed to observe at county election offices. He stated that, as the State Election Board serves as the state's highest election oversight body, Board representatives should be permitted access to the tabulation center to observe the process and help ensure public confidence in the integrity of election administration.

**Chairman Fervier** acknowledged the concerns raised but reiterated that he wished to understand the legal and operational basis for the existing policy before expressing a formal opinion. He confirmed that he was not opposed to Board participation but believed additional information was necessary before reaching any conclusions.

**Member King** stated that permitting a representative of the State Election Board to observe the State tabulation center would provide additional transparency and increase public trust in the election process. She noted that, because the Secretary of State was both overseeing election operations and appearing on the ballot as a candidate in the primary election, some members of the public could perceive a conflict of interest. She emphasized that allowing a Board representative to observe the process would provide an additional layer of public confidence and accountability. **Member King** clarified that she was not requesting that she personally serve in that role, but rather that an appropriate Board representative be permitted to observe election night activities.

**Chairman Fervier** agreed to present those concerns to the Secretary of State's Office and advocate for Board observation of the State tabulation center.

During the discussion, Mr. White informed the Board that Ms. Sara had temporarily lost her internet connection and would rejoin the meeting shortly.

No motion was made, and no action was taken by the Board.

#### IV. – THE BOARD WAS ADDRESSED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JAMES MILLS

##### Open Records Management Software (JustFOIA) Discussion

Executive Director James Mills presented a proposal to purchase the **JustFOIA Open Records Management System**, informing the Board of the expenditure because the anticipated cost exceeded the spending threshold previously established by the Board. **Chairman Fervier** noted his support for the proposal.

Mr. Mills explained that the software carries an estimated cost of **\$14,386** and was presented to the Board to ensure compliance with the Board's prior directive requiring notification of expenditures exceeding **\$10,000**. He advised that the entire agency had reviewed the product demonstration and that the proposal had been evaluated extensively with the agency's Open Records Officer, Shaun White.

Mr. Mills stated that implementation of the software is expected to save approximately **7 to 10 staff hours per week** in processing open records requests, resulting in an estimated annual labor savings of approximately **\$10,000**. He further explained that the system would:



- Provide secure cloud-based storage for open records files and related documents.
- Automate and significantly improve the document redaction process.
- Offer ongoing training and monthly webinars for agency staff.
- Improve efficiency in managing and fulfilling Open Records Act requests.

Open Records Officer Shaun White provided additional comments regarding the operational benefits of the software. He explained that:

- The automated redaction feature would reduce the likelihood of inadvertently overlooking confidential information during document review.
- The system would maintain previously released records in a searchable public repository, reducing duplicate requests.
- Automated acknowledgements and workflow management would assist the agency in meeting the statutory three-business-day response requirement for open records requests.
- Enhanced search capabilities would improve document retrieval and eliminate many of the performance issues currently experienced when searching large email repositories and electronic files through Microsoft Outlook and Microsoft Purview.
- The software's cloud-based delivery system would allow large document productions to be transmitted through a single secure download rather than multiple email transmissions.

Following the presentation, ***Chairman Fervier*** stated that the Executive Director possesses the authority to make operational purchases necessary for the agency but acknowledged that the Board had previously required notification of expenditures exceeding \$10,000. He thanked Executive Director Mills for bringing the matter before the Board and invited questions or discussion from the members.

No questions or objections were raised by the Board. ***Chairman Fervier*** indicated that the Board considered the proposal approved and authorized Executive Director Mills to proceed with the purchase.

No formal motion or vote was taken. The Board expressed its support for the acquisition, recognizing that the software would improve operational efficiency, enhance compliance with Georgia's Open Records Act, and allow staff to devote additional time to other agency responsibilities.

## V. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion:** Member Grubbs made a motion to adjourn the Special Meeting, April 22, 2026

**Second:** Vice Chair, Dr. Johnston

**Vote:** Passed 3-0

**In Favor:** Member King, Member Grubbs and Member Ghazal

Meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.